REMARKS

To date, the Examiner has not indicated that the subject matter of the information disclosure statements (IDSs) filed on 05/03/2004, and 08/10/06 has been properly considered. A copy of the FORM 1449's from such IDSs are submitted herewith. If the Examiner requires additional copies of any reference(s), applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned. Documentation in the file wrapper of the instant application confirming the Examiner's consideration of the reference(s) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has further rejected the claims on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting. Such rejection is deemed avoided by virtue of the terminal disclaimer filed May 03, 2004, copy attached.

Additionally, the Examiner has rejected Claims 2 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Such rejection is deemed avoided by virtue of the amendments made to the claims hereinabove.

Still yet, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by MS Internet Explorer (IE). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the clarifications made to the claims. Specifically, Claims 1-20 have been cancelled in favor of new Claims 21-46. After reviewing the prior art of record, it is argued that the prior art either alone or in combination doesn't teach the following limitations:

"allowing a user to pre-select one of the identifiers which is different from the URLs; and
thereafter,
displaying the content associated with at least one of the URLs utilizing the network browser,

correlating selected displayed content with the pre-selected identifier <u>in a manner that is based on the pre-selected identifier which is different from the URLs,</u> and

storing the selected displayed content" (see Claim 21 – emphasis added);

"computer code for correlating displayed content with the pre-selected identifier <u>in a manner that is dependent on the pre-selection of the pre-selected identifier which is separate from the at least one URL,</u> and further storing the displayed content" (see Claim 40 – emphasis added);

"computer code for correlating selected displayed content with the pre-selected identifier <u>in a manner that is dependent on the pre-selected identifier which is distinct with respect to the URLs</u>" (see Claim 41 – emphasis added);

"means for storing the content and correlating selected displayed content with the pre-selected identifier <u>in a manner that is based on the pre-selected identifier which is distinct with respect to the URLs,</u> after the pre-selection" (see Claim 42 – emphasis added);

"computer code for correlating selected displayed content with the pre-selected identifier <u>in a manner that is based on the pre-selected identifier which is different from the URLs,</u> and further storing the selected displayed content" (see Claim 43 – emphasis added);

"correlating selected displayed content with the pre-selected identifier for archival purposes <u>in a manner that is based on the selection of the pre-selected identifier which is different from the at least one URL,</u> after the pre-selection and upon the selection of the selected displayed content" (see Claim 44 – emphasis added);

"computer code for performing the following operations after the identifier is clicked:

identifying a selection of the content,

as a result of the selection, correlating the content with the clicked identifier in a manner that is based on the pre-selected identifier which is different from the URLs, and

storing the content" (see Claim 45 -- emphasis added); or

"correlating the displayed content with the pre-selected identifier in a manner that is based on the pre-selected identifier which is separate from the URLs for storage purposes" (see Claim 46 -- emphasis added).

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. This criterion has simply not been met by the above reference, as noted above.

Thus, a notice of allowance or specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim elements, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

To this end, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The

Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. SVIPGP003C).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC.

/KEVINZILKA/

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100